

GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY



Our Ref: MGLA110216-4881

23 March 2016

Dear 

I write to provide our response to your request for information that the GLA received on the 10 February 2016.

Your request covers information that required careful consideration for us to be in a position to respond. This meant we were not able to respond to you as quickly as we would have hoped within the 20 working day deadline under regulation 5(2) of the EIR. I apologise for any inconvenience this may have caused.

The information requested meets the definition of environmental information under the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (EIR) as measures and administrative measures (policies, plans, programmes, agreements and activities) affecting or likely to affect the elements of the environment including landscape. Your request has therefore been handled under the EIR.

We can today provide you with our formal response. Your request asked for the release of the following information:

A) Minutes of all meetings between the mayor's office or its representatives and property developers or their representatives following the calling-in of the 16 applications referred to in the original request.

For the following applications, we can confirm that no minutes were recorded:

- Monmouth House
- Blossom Street
- Trocoll House
- 56-70 Putney High Street
- City Forum
- Eileen House
- Mount Pleasant
- Holy Trinity Primary School
- Southwark Free School
- London Fruit and Wool Exchange
- SITA Recycling Park
- Saatchi Block
- Southhall Gas Works
- Hertsmere House

Minutes relating to the Convoys Wharf call-in are attached to this response.

Personal details including names of junior staff have been withheld in line with 12 (3) of the EIR as outlined below.

Minutes relating to the Bishopsgate Goodsyards call-in fall under exceptions to our duty to release information under:

12 (4) (d) material which is still in the course of completion, to unfinished documents or to incomplete data;

12 (5) (e) the confidentiality of commercial or industrial information where such confidentiality is provided by law to protect a legitimate economic interest;

Applying EIR exceptions requires the GLA to balance the 'public interest' and assess how disclosing or withholding serve the greater good or interests of the wider public as a whole. By way of background, the reason why an applicant may ask for the information does not form part of our consideration and when we provide information to an applicant we are effectively putting the information into the public domain and committing to provide the same response to anyone.

The regulations require us to apply a general presumption in favour of disclosure and withhold only if, in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exception outweighs the public interest in disclosure. On balance, we conclude the public interest in this case falls in favour of maintaining the exception; the rationale behind our decision can be found in the annex below.

A report by the GLA planning officer, detailing all aspects of the application; including a summary of the draft s106 agreement will be made available to the public 7 clear days in advance of the hearing. There is currently not a hearing date set but when it is known it will be made available on the following web page.

<https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/planning/planning-applications-and-decisions/public-hearings/bishopsgate-goodsyard-public>

I hope that the enclosed information is of interest and I would again thank you for your patience and understanding in this matter. If you have any further questions relating to this matter, please contact me, quoting the reference at the top of this letter.

Yours sincerely



Senior Coordinator & Planning Technician

If you are unhappy with the way the GLA has handled your request, you may complain using the complaints procedure, available at: <http://www.london.gov.uk/about-us/greater-london-authority-gla/sharing-our-information/freedom-information>

How the exception applies to this information

12(4)(d) — material in the course of completion:

Regulation 12(4)(d) refers to material still in the course of completion, unfinished documents or incomplete data. According to guidance published by the Information Commissioner information in finished documents may form part of material still in the course of completion where it is informing the policy formulation process. The information informs the planning decision under consideration. The information is liable to change and its relevance is yet to be determined. The exception is therefore engaged. As a class based exception adverse effects are considered during the public interest test.

EIR 12(5)(e) – the confidentiality of commercial or industrial information where such confidentiality is provided by law to protect a legitimate economic interest.

Is the information commercial or industrial in nature?

The information is commercial relating to issues of potential scheme cost, scale, mitigation and appraisal so the condition of the exception is satisfied.

Is the information confidential under the common law of confidence, contract, or a statutory bar?

The information is held under the expectation that it would not be widely circulated and a duty of confidence applies. Some information is covered by common-law of confidence – is not trivial in nature, has the necessary qualities of confidence, and was provided as part of a process where both parties expected certain information would be held in confidence. Given the sensitive nature of the information, the confidentiality is deserving of legal protection and therefore can be said to be provided by law to protect legitimate economic interests within the meaning of exception 12(5)(e). Disclosure would adversely damage the confidentiality and the economic interests identified. The confidentiality exception is therefore engaged.

Is the confidentiality protecting a legitimate economic interest?

Disclosure would harm the legitimate economic interests that the confidentiality protects including the developer's commercial interests (market position, commercially valuable information, negotiating position) and the GLA's exercise of its statutory function.

Will the confidentiality be adversely affected by disclosure?

Given the harm to the confidential nature of the information held under confidence and the legitimate economic interests, this element is satisfied.

13(1) – personal data

Names of individuals have been redacted / withheld as disclosure would contravene the first principle of the Data Protection Act 1998, that processing be fair and lawful. The individuals concerned have a legitimate expectation that their names and contact details will not be made public.

Public interest test

Considerations favouring disclosure

In its statutory duty, the GLA must ascertain how far proposals meet the needs of the local community, are viable, cost-effective, maximise developers' mitigation and reduce burden on public purse. There is a strong public interest in releasing information that informs the public and helps them scrutinize the appropriateness of the GLA's approach to considering the strengths and weaknesses of the proposals.

The scale of the proposals merits a high level of public scrutiny. Fostering greater transparency of planning matters improves understanding of how the planning process works and the basis upon which decisions are made. Enabling affected communities to better engage in the planning process is clearly

in the public interest. The GLA is also mindful of regulation 12(2) of the EIR instructing authorities to apply a presumption in favour of disclosure.

Considerations favouring non-disclosure

The Mayor notified the boroughs that he would act as the local planning authority in September 2015. A consultation has taken place and a representation hearing for this case is yet to be scheduled. The consideration of the proposed scheme is therefore very much live.

During this stage, the GLA needs to engage candidly and robustly with the applicant developer to properly interrogate the potential impact of all issues relevant to the proposals in a way that best informs our deliberation in the public interest.

Disclosing incomplete or unfinished information, prior to any decision being reached, does not present a full picture or shed light on underlying thinking. Instead, it would affect our ability to engage in honest and free-flowing exchange of views.

Disclosure of the specific information in this case, in the form of minutes containing actions to carry out further research and provide further clarification, would focus debate on whether the issues raised by the GLA are indicative of likely approval or refusal of the proposals as a whole. Officials would be deterred from raising issues requiring interrogation in the public interest for fear of negative publicity that they would err too much in favour of, or against, the proposed schemes. This would be to the detriment of public engagement with the substantive issues involved and impact the public perception of the commercial interests of the parties involved.

Furthermore, it is to the GLA's commercial interests to have sufficient information in support of applications as to be able to scrutinize proposals effectively in the public interest. Publishing information shared under an expectation of confidentiality would affect the third party's confidence in sharing information where it felt that information whose disclosure could harm its commercial interests were not being sufficiently protected.

Disclosing information which enables scrutiny would encourage confidence in the GLA's methodology and approach. At the same time a large amount of information is already in the public domain, on both the GLA and developer websites, regarding both the proposals themselves and the wider planning process the GLA is following in this case. A report by the GLA planning officer including a summary of the draft s106 agreement will be made available to the public in advance of the future hearing.

Having balanced the public interest, we consider this falls in favour of maintaining the exception, and withhold the information at this time.

Minutes



Purpose of Meeting	Highways Meeting		
Project	Convoys Wharf	Project No	UN50269
Prepared By	[REDACTED]	Phone No	[REDACTED]
Place of Meeting	20 St Thomas Street London SE1 9RS	Date/Time	4 December 2013
Present	[REDACTED] Transport for London [REDACTED], London River Services [REDACTED], London Borough of Lewisham [REDACTED], Longboard Consulting [REDACTED] Project Centre [REDACTED] Hutchison Whampoa Property Group [REDACTED] bptw [REDACTED], SKM Colin Buchanan		
Distribution	As above plus [REDACTED], Greater London Authority		

Item	Action By/Date
<p>1) Introductions</p> <p>ACo outlined scheme and timescales. Assuming outline consent granted in early 2014, the first element of the development could commence on site in 2015. A 10 year build programme is anticipated.</p> <p>ACr noted that the scheme would be reported to the Mayor at a Public Hearing in February 2014. ET noted that an interim report would be presented to LB Lewisham Members on 16 January 2013</p> <p>Estimates of population/employment to be provided by phase to assist planning of Riverbus and bus services</p>	bptw
<p>2) Riverbus enhancements</p> <p>AT stated enhancement of existing Riverbus services likely to be most-cost effective option. Upon receipt of population/employment numbers, he would develop options for consideration. He also offered to provide guidelines for pier design.</p> <p>PH clarified that the £4.25M in the S106 Heads of Terms was split into £3M for river bus subsidy and £1.25M for construction of the jetty/pier/pontoon.</p> <p>PH agreed to provide Marine Terminal Assessment and previous correspondence with Thames Clippers to assist analyses</p>	<p>AT</p> <p>HWPG</p>

3) Bus enhancements/New King Street

TW ran through his e-mail of 29 November 2013 (as attached at Appendix A). TW/CP keen to see diversion of bus through development as soon as possible – triggers to be defined within S106 agreement. CT noted desire from LBL for additional bus stops on Grove Street between site access and Oxestalls Road.

TW to provide further detail on anticipated enhancements to bus service provision. On basis spine road would not be adopted, TW also offered to provide standard access agreement.

TW

TW noted preference for widening of New King Street to permit two-way bus working – if achievable, this would be an improvement on the one-way proposal within current highways limits. ACo noted this but reiterated that the Transport Assessment had demonstrated that the two-way scheme was not absolutely essential for the development, as buses could access the development via Prince Street.

ET

ET noted that consultation had commenced regarding land transfer and that she was looking the S106 Heads of Terms to include “best endeavours” clauses on both sides. ET offered to set out steps for land transfer for further review.

ET/CP noted they would like more certainty over costs of works on New King Street. ACo to provide estimates undertaken to date.

SKM CB

4) Highways and Parking

ET noted LBL were reviewing the note issued by SKM CB on 2 December 2013 and would respond ASAP.

LBL

General discussion held about traffic modelling. As clarified by their post meeting note (as attached at Appendix B), TfL have accepted that the impacts of the scheme will be assessed with reference to the pre-existing TRANSYT models. Agreed SKM CB would provide TRANSYT data files and extracts from Transport Assessment to aid review with potential for follow-up meeting with Network Performance.

SKM CB

MD reiterated his view that the proposed level of residential parking provision (maximum of 0.44 spaces/unit) was considered acceptable and that further reductions were unlikely to result in a lower level of vehicle trips. CP reiterated her view that she would prefer to see the scheme catering for anticipated car ownership rather than the alternative of overspill parking onto surrounding residential streets. ACo noted that any overspill parking was likely to have an adverse impact upon bus operations.

SM ran through ongoing work on Cycle Super Highway 4 on Evelyn Street. Next set of drawings planned for issue w/b 16 December. ACo highlighted key relationships between CSH4 proposals (which are due to be implemented in 2015) and Convoys Wharf proposals, as follows:

- Evelyn Street/New King Street junction: short-term measures. CSH4 provides cycle lanes and is looking to move crossings closer to junction – sufficient to enable early parcels of

development to open at Convoys Wharf

- Evelyn Street/New King Street junction: longer-term measures. General agreement that there would need to be a reduction in traffic capacity to support primary pedestrian route between development and Deptford High Street with associated enhancements to pedestrian crossings at junction. CP noted LBL were looking at options to reduce traffic levels in northern part of Deptford High Street
- Evelyn Street/Prince Street junction. ACo noted it was likely that the junction would need to be converted to signal control at some stage during the development process, to handle additional turning movements into Convoys Wharf. CSH4 proposals involved enhancing existing mini-roundabout to improve facilities for cyclists
- Evelyn Street/Grove Street junction. ACo noted need to enhance junction to handle traffic to/from wharf in the last phase of development. CSH4 proposals would remove central right turn lane, which could have an impact upon highway capacity
- Evelyn Street/Oxestalls Road junction. ACo noted CSH4 proposals could be readily adapted to incorporate second lane on Oxestalls Road approach in last phase of development.

LBL

CP noted that traffic flow on Evelyn Street would be improved by linking of signals – to be carried forward to S106 Heads of Terms

Agreed SKM CB would develop comparison table with phasing, to identify how CSH4 proposals would be amended to accommodate Convoys Wharf proposals.

SKM CB

ACr noted earlier commitment to provide modest contribution towards proposed enhancements at Deptford Bridge/Deptford Church Street junction. TfL to check status of latest proposals and timescales

TfL

5) Next steps

All to follow up on actions outlined above

Next highways meeting planned for week beginning 6 January 2013 – all to confirm availability.

Appendix A: e-mail from Tim Wells

From: Wells Timothy
Sent: 29 November 2013 16:26
To: Crane Anne
Subject: RE: Convoys Wharf

Anne,

Have had a think about the terms and conditions for the 106 agreement shown below:

- **Trigger for payments** – first payment on first occupation of the site, subsequent payments to be determined by relating phasing of development to when service enhancements could take place.
- **Trigger for commencement of enhancement to services** – related to payments, to when suitable road(s) and other infrastructure become available within the site and/or improvements elsewhere and progress of other developments in area (to provide demand, funding and infrastructure).
- **Bus service enhancements** (subject to the normal caveats about consultation, service planning at the time etc.):
 1. diversion of a route through the site,
 2. capacity increase on Evelyn Street,
 3. provision of a new or extended route along Evelyn Street or through the site to locations to be determined taking account of other developments and sources of funding in the area.
- **Order of the enhancements** – Depending on phases and provision of suitable roads, ideally the first enhancement would be a route through the site followed by capacity increases along Evelyn Street. The timing of enhancement 3 would be dependent upon the progress of other developments in the area.
- **Payment** direct to TfL. Legal agreement to be drafted to ensure delivery of service enhancements as payments made and subject to the other provisos above
- **Bus stops** to be provided by the developer to accessible bus stop guidance and developer also to pay for improvement any of those serving the site on Evelyn Street and Grove Street to meet this guidance (timing again to be related to when services commence or other public realm improvements taking place). It is accepted that there will be no stand provision on the site.
- **Bus shelters** including installation to be paid for by developer. LBSL to provide and arrange for their installation and maintenance.
- **Other bus infrastructure** (e.g. roads) on site to be provided by developer to comply with specification for use by buses and if not adopted developer should maintain to adoptable standards and ensure available to use by buses at all times (no parking, servicing etc.).
- **Rights of access** for buses and bus passengers etc. and rights to use bus stops, for shelters etc to be granted at nil cost to LBSL for say 125 years.

Minutes



- **Improvements** to existing highways to enable buses to serve the site to be undertaken/funded by the developer to be delivered to fit timing of service enhancements.

As you know LBSL aims to keep the exact enhancement fairly unspecific where possible to allow flexibility in planning gear at this time as the enhancements are being implemented.

Thanks,

Tim

Timothy Wells

Transport Planner

Network Development | Bus Directorate | Surface Transport

Transport for London

10 Flood Palestra (0R3) 19 Blackfriars Road, London SE8 8NJ
T: 020 056 161 | Ex: 86161 | E: timothywells@tfl.gov.uk

Appendix B: e-mail from Melvyn Dresner

From: Dresner Melvyn (ST) [<mailto:Melvyn.Dresner@TfL.gov.uk>]

Sent: Friday, 6 December 2013 4:02 PM

To: Cole, Adrian (SKM)

Cc: Courtney John (ST); Uddin Syed Rakib; Ajamufua Paul (ST); Ulph Andrew (ST); Crane Anne

Subject: FW: Convoys Wharf

Adrian,

The following comments are on without prejudice basis to subsequent Mayoral decision, as I need to fully understand the background before I can provide advice to Anne Crane on your proposals. I apologise to those copied in because I'm on leave next so had to deal with this as a one hit email.

In light of Stage 1 comments/ TfL Borough response we need to make sure TfL colleagues are aware of the details of the model and provide a (good) basis to assess your proposed development is providing appropriate mitigation. Though we have requested Vissim modelling for some time and it is useful tool (TfL accepts it is not being provided)– we can make decisions using Transyt/ other models if we have confidence in the coding and validation – this is the focus for this proposed meeting to raise my appreciation of the modelling issues.

John Courtney, who details are below (you may know already?) is responsible for traffic signals' Network Performance in this area and can provide advice to Syed and myself on the Transyt modelling. His availability for W/C 16 December 2014 is below. I can attend all those dates as well. Other colleagues copied in should be invited but may not be able to attend on particular days and haven't expressed a desire to attend as of writing.

I'm on leave most of next week. And would like to attend the meeting, so if you can set up the meeting via a diary invite that would be appreciated at Palestra or SKM if John agrees. If you decide to have the meeting next week without me – I would like some written feedback – otherwise I be the note taker.

As context, Hyder on behalf of TfL prepared a Transyt model for this area in 2010. I assume you have update this model with your flows, which are June 2012? I'm not clear, from the April 2013 TA what other aspects of the model you changed so it would be good to go through your validation/ audit process in some detail. If that is covered in a report please forward the relevant section.

At Stage 1, concern related underestimating car trip – I don't think the network wants more car trips, so I think this relates to the need for the s106 to provide a strong basis to restrain traffic generation for the site through demand management and provision of bus services and river services. Subject to Lewisham's comments on trip rates – I don't believe we need to relook at traffic demand from your site as part of this proposed meeting. I'm also reviewing trip rates in light of other sites in east London and I think your rates are consistent with what TfL has agreed elsewhere.

Minutes



We can't ask John Courtney to approve models or designs outside normally processes we are just hoping for you to present where you are and enable an open discussion on the models included in the TA, which may help with implementation at a later stage. If there is a need for light touch audit – we can discuss or you may wish to facilitate with John prior to meeting – though he may not have enough time. I'm unsure.

Melvyn Dresner

Principal Technical Planner| East Team| Borough Planning

Transport for London

9th Floor Windsor House

42-50 Victoria Street

SW1H 0TL

Tel: (020) 3054 7034 | **Auto:** 87034

From: Courtney John (ST)

Sent: 06 December 2013 12:46

To: Dresner Melvyn (ST); Crane Anne

Cc: Ajamufua Paul (ST); Uddin Syed Rakib; Ulph Andrew (ST)

Subject: RE: Convoys Wharf

Mon PM

Tue AM

Wed All Day

Thu N/A

Fri AM

Regards

John Courtney | Principal Traffic Control Engineer

Transport for London | Road Space Management Directorate | Surface Transport |

Minutes



Palestra

3rd floor - Zone 3B2 | 197 Blackfriars Road | London SE1 8NJ

☎: +44 (0) 20 3054 2685 A: 82685 | 📠: +44 (0) 20 3054 2008 | ✉:
johnccourtney@tfl.gov.uk

Need a copy of the TfL Traffic Modelling Guidelines or TD Model Auditing Process?

Download the latest versions from <http://www.tfl.gov.uk/trafficmodelling>

Minutes



Purpose of Meeting	Highways Meeting		
Project	Convoys Wharf	Project No	UN50269
Prepared By	[REDACTED]	Phone No	[REDACTED]
Place of Meeting	20 St Thomas Street London SE1 9RS	Date/Time	16 December 2013
Present	[REDACTED], Transport for London [REDACTED] London Borough of Lewisham [REDACTED], Project Centre [REDACTED] Hutchison Whampoa Property Group [REDACTED], SKM Colin Buchanan		
Distribution	As above plus [REDACTED] Greater London Authority, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Transport for London, [REDACTED], London Borough of Lewisham, [REDACTED], Longboard Consulting		

Item	Action By/Date
<p>1) Traffic modelling</p> <p>Meeting was intended to provide overview to TfL Network Management Performance of modelling supporting outline application, however discussion was constrained by absence of key TfL personnel.</p> <p>ACo/MM provided an overview of the processes used to update the 2010 TRANSYT model which TfL had requested be used to support the 2011 submission to create a 2012 base model, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated with 2012 flows and observed queue lengths Updated with 2012 signal timing data, making use of LINSIG models Frequency with which pedestrian crossings called was assessed from on-site observations Representation of Evelyn Street/Abinger Grove roundabout improved with reference to ARCADY models Committed development flows added from relevant Transport Assessments <p>ACo noted validation processes were summarised in section 6.5 of the TA. Further detail could be provided in due course if needed</p> <p>Agreed that follow-up meeting would be arranged with [REDACTED] of TfL NMP.</p> <p>Noted TfL preparing VISSIM models to support Cycle Superhighway 4. These could be used in due course to refine the designs of the proposed improvements to Evelyn Street prior to implementation.</p>	SKM CB

2) Trip generation and parking

ACo noted proposed initial non-residential parking allocation was intended to minimise peak hour work-based trips. It would form part of the Car Park Management Plan and it would only be possible to alter allocations with the agreement of LBL and TfL.

CP stated she would like to more detail regarding the allocation of parking by phase and an undertaking that there would be a regular review of parking usage to avoid construction of unnecessary spaces.

SKM
ACr

ACr offered to provide exemplar heads of terms to assist S106 drafting

MD suggested that parking allocation is likely to constrain car trip generation and that on this basis, there would be little merit in further sensitivity analyses

3) Evelyn Street/New King Street junction

BM noted keenness to achieve traffic signal junction with all-red phase.

ACr noted TfL could cope without two-way working on New King Street although this could restrict options for bus operations.

CP noted LBL would be open to changes which took rat-running out of Deptford High Street if this would improve operation of junction, including restrictions on turning movements. Agreed complete closure of Deptford High Street north of Edward Street and/or closure of Watergate Street would reduce complexity of signal staging but would need to be balanced against need to maintain effective local access.

ACo agreed to prepare table of various options with pros and cons for further discussion

SKM

4) Next steps

All to follow up on actions outlined above

SKM CB to compile notes issued during determination period, to assist TfL reporting

SKM

Next highways meeting planned for week beginning 6 January 2013 – all to confirm availability.

Minutes



Purpose of Meeting	Transport and highways		
Project	Convoys Wharf	Project No	UN50269
Prepared By	[REDACTED]	Phone No	[REDACTED]
Place of Meeting	20 St Thomas Street London SE1 9RS	Date/Time	31 January 2014
Present	[REDACTED] Transport for London [REDACTED], London Borough of Lewisham [REDACTED], Project Centre [REDACTED], Hutchison Whampoa Property Group [REDACTED], SKM Colin Buchanan		
Distribution	As above plus [REDACTED], Greater London Authority [REDACTED], HWPG, [REDACTED], [REDACTED], bptw		

Item	Action By/Date
------	----------------

- 1) Cycle Super Highway 4 Update**

AH has taken over project with view to implementation during 2015. Preferred option being developed to facilitate public consultation in September 2014, likely to include on-road cycle lanes on Evelyn Street as opposed to two-way segregated facility. AH agreed to circulate work-in-progress drawings to facilitate S106 negotiations. AH

ET noted CSH4 proposals must include measures to enhance pedestrian movement across Evelyn Street, as encouraging modal shift is vital to support LBL's development aspirations for the corridor.
- 2) Evelyn Street/New King Street junction**

General discussion about proposed method of control. ET reiterated LBL's desire for signals with an all-red pedestrian stage, BM noting that this would also assist pedestrians crossing Deptford High Street and using eastern footway on New King Street. ACo noted that priority control would minimise delays to buses, as they could turn into/out of New King Street whilst pedestrian crossings were activated on Evelyn Street. ACo also noted that if continuous cycle lanes were to be provided on Evelyn Street through junction, it would be necessary to ban as a minimum the right turn into Deptford High Street (possibly except for cyclists) due to space limitations. ACr asked that future options consider potential for buses to use Edward Street and northern end of Deptford High Street.

Agreed that S106 heads of terms would assume provision of signal junction with all-red pedestrian stage with fall-back to priority control, final decision to be taken post consent with benefit of CSH4 VISSIM models. ET agreed to provide priority list for improvements to junction. ET

- 3) New King Street

ACr noted she was seeking confirmation of carriageway widths for bus operations. ACo noted desire to keep these to a practicable minimum, to maximise opportunities for footway widening and provision of parking bays. ACr

ET offered to provide further details of costs for recent Deptford High Street works. ET
- 4) Evelyn Street – other locations

ACo noted proposals for second lane on Oxestalls Road were compatible with emerging CSH4 proposals.

AH noted CSH4 proposals for Evelyn Street/Abinger Grove sought to retain mini-roundabout operation whereas ACo noted Convoys Wharf proposals for conversion to full signal control with all-red pedestrian stage. ACo to consider how this could be covered in S106 HOTs. SKM

ACo noted that wharf operation would eventually require minor kerbworks to facilitate left turn from Grove Street into Evelyn Street.
- 5) Bus service enhancements

TW noted TfL would like to divert Route 199 via New King Street upon opening of spine road.
- 6) Transport – S106 Heads of Terms/Trigger Points

ACo noted initial schedule had been developed, to be circulated for comment. SKM

Post meeting note: circulated on 3 February 2014
- 7) Next steps

ET to provide Deptford High Street unit costs and priority list for Evelyn Street/New King Street junction improvements ET

AH to provide CSH4 work-in-progress drawings AH

SKM to provide S106 schedule SKM

Minutes



Purpose of Meeting	New King Street		
Project	Convoys Wharf	Project No	UN50269
Prepared By	[REDACTED]	Phone No	[REDACTED]
Place of Meeting	20 St Thomas Street London SE1 9RS	Date/Time	24 January 2014
Present	[REDACTED], Transport for London [REDACTED]ot, London Borough of Lewisham [REDACTED], Project Centre [REDACTED], Hutchison Whampoa Property Group [REDACTED], Turkington Martin [REDACTED], bptw [REDACTED], SKM Colin Buchanan		
Distribution	As above plus [REDACTED], Greater London Authority		

Item	Action By/Date
<p>1) New King Street - Proposed Options</p> <p>2 options presented, as attached. Option 1 provides works within current highway land, Option 2 requires transfer of land from Lewisham Housing to Highways. Both options have been designed to work with either priority or full signal control at the Evelyn Street/New King Street junction.</p> <p>ACr noted desirability of implementing Option 2 ASAP. ET noted she was meeting with LBL valuers w/b 27 January 2014 to progress land transfer and would report back. As discussed previously, S106 agreement would need to contain fall-back provisions to ensure land transfer process does not prejudice start of scheme.</p>	LBL
<p>2) Option 2 Design and cost considerations</p> <p>ACo/IT presented Option 2 in greater detail. Proposals include widening carriageway to 7 metres to facilitate northbound bus working and provision of a 5 metre wide footway on west side, accommodating street trees. ACo noted inset parking/loading bays (24 total) currently shown in eastern footway with scope at detailed design stage for further inset parking bays to be provided on west side, particularly north of Czar Street if justified by demand. ET supported planted boundary treatment, as this would provide defensible space for existing residents on west side of New King Street.</p> <p>ET stated that New King Street improvements needed to be of similar dimension and quality to spine road within site. ACo noted cross-section shown was broadly similar to cross-section of spine road</p>	

through development. IT noted similar design approach being taken.

VN asked about scope to include dedicated cycle lanes. ACo noted these were unlikely to be required due to relatively low vehicle flows. Also noted that eventual width of New King Street constrained by garages on west side north of Csar Street. ACr invited to comment on scope for reducing two-way carriageway width whilst maintaining effective bus operations.

ACr

BM/PT suggested design approach to New King Street should also reflect ongoing proposals to enhance southern part of Deptford High Street. ET offered to source specification and unit cost estimates to compare with budget allowances for New King Street.

ET

ACo noted that current budget allowance of £1.4M had been broadly assessed as follows:

- 3,000 m² construction at average rate of £200/m² = £600,000
- Allowance for utilities diversions = £500,000
- 25% allowance for contingencies, prelims, fees = £275,000.

Noted that final unit rate would be primarily influenced by type of paving selected (concrete vs York stone or granite), the number/type of trees and approach to street lighting.

IT offered to prepare precedent images as part of the preparation of any future presentation material which may be required to describe the proposals to local residents.

IT

3) Evelyn Street/New King Street junction

Noted further meeting planned for 31 January 2014 to discuss mitigation on Evelyn Street.

BM requested more detailed consideration of impacts of reassigning traffic. Agreed SKM CB would assess this using pre-existing models.

SKM CB

4) Timing of public transport enhancements

TfL/LBL would like to see pier opened ASAP in programme and to coincide with the opening of the spine road, accepting the potential need for temporary pedestrian access routes between the spine road and the pier. HWPG to advise further upon programme implications.

HWPG

ACr noted that currently proposed trigger point for opening of spine road at 25% occupation of residential units would require a greater proportion of agreed subsidy to be put towards enhancing frequencies of bus routes remaining on Evelyn Street and asked for scope for spine road opening to be brought forward. HWPG to advise further.

HWPG

DB noted more detailed programme was being developed and would be circulated in very near future.

HWPG

Minutes



5) Next steps

ET to provide Deptford High Street unit costs

LBL

HWPG team to provide updated specification/cost build-up

HWPG/IT/
SKM CB



GERALDEVE

DRAFT

Minutes of meeting

Convoys Wharf S106 – Review mechanism meeting

Meeting on Tuesday, 23 September 2014 at 10.00am

At Gerald Eve's offices, Welbeck Street

72 Welbeck Street London W1G 0AY

www.geraldeve.com

Present:	[REDACTED]	CW	Greater London Authority (GLA)
	[REDACTED]	GC	GLA
	[REDACTED]	JM	London Borough of Lewisham (LBL)
	[REDACTED]	EH	Hutchison Whampoa (HW)
	[REDACTED]	JS	HW
	[REDACTED]	MHD	HW
	[REDACTED]	DC	HW
	[REDACTED]	EL	HW
	[REDACTED]	JB	Strutt & Parker (S&P)
	[REDACTED]	RF	Gerald Eve (GE)
	[REDACTED]	AC	GE
Apologies:	[REDACTED]	ET	LBL

		Action
1	DC considered the fundamental issue which needed addressing was the structure of the appraisal which reviewed the scheme. GE's recommendation of a phase by phase review is seen (by HW) as not identifying a true reflection of the IRR of the project through its lifetime. RF stated this approach had been used on S106s of BBC Centre (Stanhope), Wembley (Quintain) and Westfield extension in Shepard's Bush (Westfield) – and these S106s are publically available.	
2	DC and JS explained HW approach, whereby reviews are undertaken prior to implementation, then effectively fixed (or locked) in position and this fixed position is then used as a starting point for the next review appraisal, using up-to-date inputs. Losses would not be carried forward, and a minimum of 15% affordable housing would be met.	
3	RF considered that whilst he does have concerns over approach it is certainly something GE will review on behalf of the GLA and LBL if HW can issue an example model and illustration. RF stated that this approach was not expressed as clearly as it could have been as Option 2 in S&Ps initial Heads. RF recommended HW set up working appraisal meeting with GE for a technical discussion.	HW to provide example model and illustrations of approach. HW/GE/S&P to meet to discuss approach.

4	All parties agreed that Option 1 would not be an agreed approach, and HW are to develop and expand upon Option 2 further.	HW to provide further detail on Option 2.
5	RF reiterated that review should be transparent, and backed up by robust and suitable supporting information. The review mechanism put forward needs to be able to be modelled by future consultants.	
6	HW are prepared to accept the maximum policy target provision of 50% affordable housing onsite rather than a cap as surplus provision.	
7	If there is a surplus HW are prepared to accept on-site delivery at phase 1 and phase 2, and a cash payment at phase 3.	
8	HW identified a target profit IRR of 22.5% as a suitable benchmark. RF stated that he was of the view that 20% was more appropriate, and this was the basis that the Mayor made his decision. RF could be prepared to advise GLA/LBL to vary the IRR throughout each phase if HW wanted to explore this option.	HW to internally review IRR target position.
9	MHD asked on what basis are consultants looking at IRRs. RF stated the only indicator available was IPD's research on development returns, albeit this work is associated with commercial property. Each scheme is to be assessed individually and risk reward profile weighed up.	
10	JM stated that LBL would be looking for a 50%:50% surplus profit split and confirmed that LBL research showed that this was consistently the approach in similar scale schemes across London. HW considered 65%:35% in favour of HW was appropriate. CW stated he is agreeing a scheme elsewhere on the basis of 60%:40% in favour of the developer in order to incentivise them to reach and exceed the target IRR. JM stated that he felt the individual circumstances of schemes needed to be fully considered in the round in terms of the overall review mechanism outcome.	
11	Parties agreed that meetings should be set up to address modelling of scheme at review, and to finalise heads thereafter.	

Circulation: As above